

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/801,944	STROM ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Paresh Patel	2829	
All Participants:		Status of Application: _____	
(1) <u>Paresh Patel</u> .		(3) _____.	
(2) <u>Anthony G. Smyth</u> .		(4) _____.	
Date of Interview: <u>16 February 2007</u>		Time: _____	
Type of Interview: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Telephonic <input type="checkbox"/> Video Conference <input type="checkbox"/> Personal (Copy given to: <input type="checkbox"/> Applicant <input type="checkbox"/> Applicant's representative)			
Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No If Yes, provide a brief description:			
Part I.			
Rejection(s) discussed:			
Claims discussed: 1			
Prior art documents discussed:			
Part II.			
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: <i>See Continuation Sheet</i>			
Part III.			
<input type="checkbox"/> It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. <input type="checkbox"/> It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.			

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: On 02/12/2006, the Examiner called Mr. Smyth to overcome 35 USC 101 issue (which brought up during conference for Appeal Brief that was filed on 10/30/2006) and for possible allowance with amendment to independent claims (to overcome the Harris reference). Examiner suggested a language i.e. calculating probe float by subtracting results of said acquiring from said obtaining for claim 1 and similar language for other independent claims. Mr. Smyth consulted the client, later on 02/16/2006 the Examiner was informed that the reference Harris does not disclose method steps of claim 1. Regarding 35 USC 101 issue, Mr. Smyth requested an office action..